

ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
OF ILLINOIS.

For Vice President of the United States,

HANNIBAL HAMLIN,
OF MAINE.

For Presidential Electors of the State at large,

FREDERICK HASSAUREK.

JOSEPH M. ROOT.

Congressional District.

1st District—R. Egbertson.

2d. " William M. Dickson.

3d. " Frank McWhinney.

4th. " John Riley Knox.

5th. " B. W. H. Howard.

6th. " John M. Kellum.

7th. " Nelson Bush.

8th. " Abraham Thompson.

9th. " R. P. L. Fisher.

10th. " John D. Willard.

11th. " B. S. Bundy.

12th. " Daniel B. Stewart.

13th. " R. P. L. Fisher.

14th. " John D. Willard.

15th. " Joseph Adams.

16th. " Edward Ball.

17th. " John A. Davenport.

18th. " William K. Epham.

19th. " Samuel P. Burdick.

20th. " George W. Brooks.

21st. " N. K. M. Kenzie.

BABEL BUILDING.

Truly, there is nothing new under the sun.

A very ancient record gives an account of a great "fusion" demonstration in the Plains of Shinar, with its happy results.

The descendants of these "fusionists" are improving upon the work of their "illustrious predecessors."

The original Babel builders undertook the erection of their "Tower" out of brick and lime.

Our modern Babel builders are using the same material, except the brick.

We are told that the language of the old-time builders was "confounded," and themselves scattered abroad.

That our readers may see the "confusion worse confounded" of the modern "Shinar," we give a few of the latest specimens of their language.

There are four Electoral tickets in Ohio—the Republicans, Douglassites, Bellegines, and Breckinridgers.

The last three, about to be scattered abroad, proposed to build a modern "Tower," and thinking their forefathers' failure resulted from their using too many "bricks," resolved to make theirs of stone alone, of which they seem to have an inexhaustible supply.

But we think they will soon leave off building, for their language is already so confounded that they cannot understand each other.

In proof of this, see the following extracts. (The first is from the Cincinnati Enquirer, (Douglas) of the 15th inst.—It says:

"If all opposition to Lincoln in New York can write upon an Electoral ticket why can not the same elements be brought together in Ohio?"

Sure enough! Why not bring the proslavery Know-Nothing and Irish Catholic—the Slave-Code Breckinridge and Squatter Douglass—all into one embrace? All, and each, in their turn, cry out that the Union will be dissolved, and a "smash up" generally will follow the election of Lincoln.

Each charges the other with being the allies of Republicanism, and clamors for "fusion." But each wants to cheat the other, and all are mutually suspected of treachery, and neither will trust the other. The next extract is from the Toledo Times. It uses this very brotherly language. It says:

"The Cincinnati Enquirer, Plain Dealer, and other staunch Douglas papers, recommend a 'fusion' of all those opposed to the election of Lincoln, to save Ohio, if possible, from casting her vote for the Republican nominee. We do not propose now to enter into a discussion, as to whether fusion, to a certain extent, is prudent or unwise; but in the name of the betrayed and deeply wronged Democratic party, we enter our solemn protest against a fusion with the contemptible faction which constitute the Breckinridge faction in Ohio. The name of a single person on the Electoral ticket who has upon him even the taint of the miserable Thibault now in the Executive chair, would insure the overwhelming disgrace and defeat of the whole ticket. No honest Democrat would vote for any man who is in any way connected with the Thibault faction, who has destroyed and betrayed the organization that placed him in power."

If the integrity of the Democratic party is to be preserved, let no such attempt be made. Fusion with honest men would command the respect and receive the support of all who upon principle despise Lincoln's defeat, but with the miserable Thibault gang who are the tools of this Administration it would disgust all honorable men."

That looks like rapid "building," does it not? Won't the Tower soon be erected if the workmen progress in this fashion? But here is another course. It is from the Enquirer again. It calls upon its brother, the Ohio Statesman, in this style:

"Will our friends of the Columbus Statesman please inform us what the Democratic Central Committee has done, or has in contemplation, in relation to a union of the national parties in Ohio upon a single Electoral ticket?"

To this call, the Statesman replies in a long article of which the following are extracts:

"We say to the Enquirer, as we said yesterday morning in relation to the communication from Mr. Verano, that the best and most effective way to rally the opposition in Ohio, and concentrate it against Republicanism and Lincolnism, is for all of it—All National men, of all creeds and persuasions—all who are opposed to sectionalism, to concentrate action on the Electoral ticket. Let this city on the 4th of July, 1860, and to the support of which all Union-loving men were then and there invited to give aid. We feel sure that such is the true course for all good and true Union men to pursue. That ticket is now the representative of justice—eighties of the Union and conservative element of the State, and to disturb it would be to weaken it very much."

So, so! Fusion, according to the Statesman, would only weaken the ticket. We think the Statesman is right. And

in all conscience it is weak enough now.

But the Enquirer will have fusion whether or not, and threatens, if the Committee will not call themselves together, the Enquirer will call them, and make a fusion with the Bellegines, and Breckinridgers whether or not.

And therefore a committee of Douglassites and Bell leaders call upon Hon. George Fries, one of the Breckinridge Electors, and requested him to "fuse." The Hon. Breckinridge replies and from his reply we take the following choice paragraph. The Dr. says:

"Since the State election, those men who spurned us sixty days since to too small a party to be of any importance in so great a contest as that going on in the great State of Ohio, where three or four hundred thousand votes were to be cast, now call their parties dead, come to us and ask us to fuse. No, sir, if I am to be put to bed, it shall not be with the carcasses of a dead dog—the Douglas party and the Know Nothing party—and in the language of the old Whig party, 'They are not only dead but they stink!'"

Well, that is rather specific. It is classical; and will pass into future use as one of the happiest epigrams of the age. "The Douglas party, and the Know Nothing party," in the language of Dr. Fries are "dead dogs," and stink at that. And he is not prepared to "cuddle under dirty bed clothes" with them. Go it, Fries! The Tower will soon be built! But now comes the Cincinnati Times, the organ of the "Bellegines," and brings his "hod" full. In the course of a long article, from which we extract, the Times says:

"The fusion contagion has reached Ohio. The Enquirer, and other Douglas organs, are justly calling upon the State Central Committee of that party to assemble and tender terms of compromise to their 'Union allies.' The Central Bell and Everett organization and the Electors of the same party, have enjoyed a consultation, in our city, with the view of ascertaining the sentiment of the Bell and Everett voters as to the same point. And for the sake of furthering the projected election returns have been falsified, shuffling facts distorted, and a vast amount of editorial whistling done, to keep the fusion contagion up."

The Times, after showing that no honest purpose can be subserved by "fusion," continues:

"This fusion movement is a sharp dog of the friends of Stephen A. Douglas. It is a shrewd measure to save the sinking fortunes of the Illinois Senator, and like everything heretofore connected with the Douglas movement, breathes death and destruction to all who participate in it."

And after showing that the Bell party had been deceived by the lying pretenses of the strength of Douglas, into fusing with them in other States, the Times continues:

"We consider the New York fusion an act of deliberate suicide. It has already turned the triumph of the party it sought to defeat, and if extended throughout the North, will strangle the infant Union."

"With our understanding of the sentiment of the people—and we have been a close observer for many years—we believe that any cause will be damaged by a union with the Democratic party. We have already thrown out the opinion, and backed by the exhibit of the late elections, that that combination with the Douglas party in the Northern States, will only serve to increase the relative Republican strength. If Lincoln is elected, to Douglassism first, and a fusion with Douglassism second and lastly, may be attributed the sectional triumph."

Surely, a few more such rounds as that will finish the Tower. And here we have one from the National Democrat, of Cleveland, the organ of Breckinridge Democracy in Northern Ohio. It reads as follows:

"The Cincinnati Enquirer has shown an anxiety to fuse with the Know Nothings—it has invited the dark-lantern party to make common cause with Douglas. That paper and the Statesman are as much united in feeling as the Siamese twins are united in body. They seek their associates out of the Democratic party—seek them among the most bitter, proslavery and unprincipled party that ever disgraced the country, and they wish to use them in future. Men who do this—who coalesce with the enemies of the Democracy, are no longer with the Democratic party, or belong to its organization. They are, as were the Swiss in the days of the Revolution, but the hiring soldiers of those who would pay them best. They are no more than nothing in its triumph in Kentucky, they will ever add in its conflict against the supporters of Breckinridge and Lane."

"With such men we wish to have no terms. Led on by such men as Manypenny, of the Statesman, they cannot act honestly while following their lead. A union in Ohio would be of no sort of use, for no earthly dependence could be placed on the supporters of the 'Little Squatter,' for they have been tried and have proven faithless to every pledge."

That is the contribution which the leading Breckinridge organ brings to the great work of fusion. Is it not encouraging? Surely, with such a cordial union and such an intimate "cuddling" of the leaders of all the factions, along with "dead dogs" under "dirty bed clothes," and soothed with Dr. Fries' perfume, our modern Babel builders must succeed.

And in view of all this, the Enquirer has the face, in its issue of the 19th inst., actually to call together the Democratic State Central Committee and the Democratic Electors, with the view of a "trade and dieker" with the Bell and Breckinridge parties! If the editor is not insane, it is because he is a "born idiot."

We hope the "fusion" may be entered into. If it is we will warrant Lincoln 50,000 majority in the State. "Whom the gods intend to destroy, they first make mad."

They Give it Up.

The Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, Democratic, says: "We would be doing violence to our own convictions, and injustice to our readers, if we failed to express the belief that there is now no responsible grounds to expect the defeat of Lincoln and the sectional Republican party. Pennsylvania was the battle-ground, and, in our opinion, Pennsylvania has decided the contest."

SECTIONALISM.

While the Southern disunionists and their Northern servitors are shouting "sectionalism" at the Republican party, every paper from the land of slaves comes freighted with scenes of lynching, outrage and murder, committed upon citizens of the Free States, whose business leads them into that region.

William J. Brewster, an accomplished teacher, of Massachusetts, threatened with consumption, was advised to seek the restorative effects of a warmer climate. Having acquaintances in Somerville, Alabama, who learned his wishes, a school was got up, and he was earnestly invited to take charge of it. Under this engagement he left his home and arrived at Somerville. The Lynch Committee tried to break up the school, but those who had employed Mr. Brewster would not break their contract with him. And, therefore, the chivalry proceeded to their usual work. The Somerville Democrat gives its version of the affair, making, of course, the worst case possible against Mr. Brewster, as follows:

"The people of Somerville took the case in hand on Friday morning, the 5th ult. Brewster denied that he ever uttered Abolition sentiments. On searching his trunk, however, the following letter was found:

"BOSTON, OCT. 20, 1856.

"My Dear Sir: I am glad that the friends of freedom in Middleboro' are about to organize. Let the work go on. Better to fail on our side than to succeed on the side of slavery."

"Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

"William J. Brewster."

There were also several Abolition papers in his possession, but they were torn and used as wrapping paper. One of the papers contained a sermon of Henry Ward Beecher. Thus the proof is overwhelming that Brewster is an Abolitionist. He received orders to leave these 'diggins' by twelve o'clock."

Will you look at that? Here is a gentleman of the highest culture and standing—an American citizen on American soil—in the legitimate pursuit of an honorable profession, surrounded by ruffians in the persons of the leading men of Somerville. His trunk broken open and his private papers searched, and what was found? A private letter from a United States Senator, whose learning, eloquence, and spotless character gives dignity to our country, and several torn scraps of Northern newspapers, used as wrapping paper, in one of which was a sketch of a sermon by Henry Ward Beecher! That was all, even taking the Democrat's account of it. And yet the Democrat says this was "proof overwhelming" that Brewster was an Abolitionist! And on this proof he is ordered to leave his business, and the State, instantly.

To be sure, he was treated mildly in comparison to many others. The wonder is that he escaped with his life at all. But may it not be an interesting question for these desperadoes to ask, "how long will the people of the Free States submit to such treatment?" We know that the Democrat and its Lynch Committees rely upon the aid of their dirty accomplices here. But party ties are not strong enough to crush out the whole of manhood, and make the mass of the Democratic party in the Free States the willing forgers of their own chains. The late elections prove this. And, although the dough-faced leaders play the originating spaniel to their masters, the honest men of the party will not be enslaved. And woe to those bandits when the patience of the great conservative masses of the people are exhausted by these outrages!

Negro Insurrection.

A terrible excitement seems to prevail in portions of Virginia and extending into North Carolina, in consequence of what is supposed to be another Slave insurrection. Many negroes have been arrested and flogged until confessions of some kind have been extorted from them. The process seems to be, to take a negro and flog him unmercifully without giving him the slightest intimation of what it is for. Under the pains of the torture, the victim begs to be released or at least told the nature of his offense. He is then told that a plot for an insurrection has been discovered, and that if he will "confess" he shall be released. Of course the poor fellow, fainting under his torments, confesses to anything that may be suggested to him. And in this way any amount of contemplated "horrors" becomes revealed. If there is a white man of whom they want to get rid, the tortured slave may be made to implicate him, when his doom is sealed of course. Madness itself could not devise a surer method of getting up a real "insurrection" than these fanatics are pursuing. But, if they will sow the wind, they can but reap the whirlwind. Several persons have been arrested on these extorted confessions. What the end may be, the future will develop.

A Good Paper for Every Family.

Our readers may not be acquainted with one of the most valuable agricultural and family journals in the country, now in its nineteenth volume. We refer to the American Agriculturist, which is a large and beautiful journal, devoted to the practical labors of the Field, Garden, and the household. It is prepared by practical men (and women) who know what they write about, and it gives a great amount of valuable information, useful not only to farmers, gardeners, stock-raisers, fruit growers, and those who have little village plots, but also to every family. We advise our readers to send \$1 to the publisher, Orange Judd, 41 Park Row, New York, and try the Agriculturist a year. A specimen copy can doubtless be had by sending to the publisher. Those subscribing now for the twentieth volume, (1861), will get the remaining numbers of this year without charge.

DOUGLAS AND LECOMPTON AGAIN.

On the first page, will be found the sworn statements of a number of prominent Democrats, going to show that Douglas was privy to, and in fact the prime instigator of, the fraudulent and disgraceful mode of submitting the Lecompton Constitution to the vote of the people of that Territory. The whole of the evidence presented would fill nearly a page of the Telegraph. We had not room for it all, nor did we deem it of sufficient importance to cumber our columns with more of it than will be there found. But since it was in type, we have received a report of a speech made by Douglas, at Milwaukee on the 13th inst., in which he notices the charge, and in his peculiar way, denies its truth. We give the points of Douglas' denial in the following extracts from his speech. Douglas says:

"An Abolition newspaper has just been placed in my hands, containing what purports to be a correspondence between a Breckinridge Committee in Kansas, and certain citizens of that Territory. I have no means of knowing whether this correspondence is genuine or fictitious. I have looked over the names attached to it, and recognize no one as a personal acquaintance. In this correspondence I am distinctly charged with being the author of the Lecompton Constitution. [Great laughter.] I do not blame you for laughing at that statement. [Renewed laughter.] If there is any statement on earth that ought to seem ludicrous and laughable, it is a charge of this kind. I am distinctly charged with being the author of the Lecompton Constitution, but that it was submitted to me and that I approved it, together with the plan of submitting the Slavery clause. [Laughter.] I desire to say to you that it is false in every particular. [Immense applause.] I never saw the Lecompton Constitution until after it had been adopted in Kansas by the Convention, and sent to the President of the United States for acceptance, &c."

There is Douglas' denial! The pitiful dodge, that the charge was found in an "Abolition" newspaper is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as all the world knows, that "Abolitionists" and "Abolition newspapers" had nothing to do with the matter at all. The whole thing is a Democratic guard, in which a Republican free press is worthy only of Stephen A. Douglas! But we don't suppose it possible for him to utter two sentences without marring one of them by slang. Why could he not name the paper? The Judge knows, as